

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 76%. The FFY 2006 data were 77%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 80%.	OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																												
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 3.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 3.5%.	OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																												
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92% for reading and 99.2% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 93.8% for reading, and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92.7% for math. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 99% for math but did not meet its target of 97.5% for reading.	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																												
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported participation data for this indicator are: <table><tr><td>Grade</td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td></tr><tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Reading</td><td colspan="3">Math</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td></td><td>98.9%</td><td>98%</td><td></td><td>99.2%</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>98.8%</td><td>99.6%</td><td>98%</td><td>98.8%</td><td>99.6%</td><td>98%</td></tr></table>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3		98.9%	98%		99.2%	98%	4	98.8%	99.6%	98%	98.8%	99.6%	98%	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																								
	Reading			Math																										
3		98.9%	98%		99.2%	98%																								
4	98.8%	99.6%	98%	98.8%	99.6%	98%																								

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
[Results Indicator]	<table><tr><td>5</td><td></td><td>98.9%</td><td>98%</td><td></td><td>98.9%</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td></td><td>98.5%</td><td>98%</td><td></td><td>98.4%</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td></td><td>98.1%</td><td>98%</td><td></td><td>97.7%</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>96.6%</td><td>98%</td><td>98%</td><td>96.6%</td><td>97.3%</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>HS</td><td>87.1%</td><td>92.5%</td><td>93%</td><td>92.3%</td><td>95.7%</td><td>93%</td></tr></table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data in grades 4, 8, and 11 for reading, and for math.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p>	5		98.9%	98%		98.9%	98%	6		98.5%	98%		98.4%	98%	7		98.1%	98%		97.7%	98%	8	96.6%	98%	98%	96.6%	97.3%	98%	HS	87.1%	92.5%	93%	92.3%	95.7%	93%																													
5		98.9%	98%		98.9%	98%																																																											
6		98.5%	98%		98.4%	98%																																																											
7		98.1%	98%		97.7%	98%																																																											
8	96.6%	98%	98%	96.6%	97.3%	98%																																																											
HS	87.1%	92.5%	93%	92.3%	95.7%	93%																																																											
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported performance data for this indicator are:</p> <table><tr><td>Grade</td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td></tr><tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Reading</td><td colspan="3">Math</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td></td><td>33.7%</td><td>50%</td><td></td><td>43.8%</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>37%</td><td>31.5%</td><td>49%</td><td>27%</td><td>36.3%</td><td>32%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td></td><td>28.6%</td><td>50%</td><td></td><td>33.4%</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td></td><td>33.7%</td><td>50%</td><td></td><td>23.3%</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td></td><td>34.4%</td><td>50%</td><td></td><td>21.5%</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>15%</td><td>28.8%</td><td>50%</td><td>14%</td><td>18.7%</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>HS</td><td>10%</td><td>16.2%</td><td>57%</td><td>6%</td><td>12.9%</td><td>33%</td></tr></table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data in grades 8 and 11 for reading and grades 4, 8, and 11 for math, and slippage from the FFY 2006 data in grade 4 for reading.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2007 performance targets for this indicator.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3		33.7%	50%		43.8%	40%	4	37%	31.5%	49%	27%	36.3%	32%	5		28.6%	50%		33.4%	40%	6		33.7%	50%		23.3%	40%	7		34.4%	50%		21.5%	40%	8	15%	28.8%	50%	14%	18.7%	33%	HS	10%	16.2%	57%	6%	12.9%	33%	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3		33.7%	50%		43.8%	40%																																																											
4	37%	31.5%	49%	27%	36.3%	32%																																																											
5		28.6%	50%		33.4%	40%																																																											
6		33.7%	50%		23.3%	40%																																																											
7		34.4%	50%		21.5%	40%																																																											
8	15%	28.8%	50%	14%	18.7%	33%																																																											
HS	10%	16.2%	57%	6%	12.9%	33%																																																											
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data</p>	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance. As noted in the revised Part B Indicator																																																															

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information related to the State's review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the one LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	
	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.4	57	62	
	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.6	11.5	10	
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.5	3.5	3.7	
	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. These data represent progress for 5B and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2006 data. The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 5A and 5B.				
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.				The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills	The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:				The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>(including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	APR, due February 1, 2010.
	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	20	23	8	
	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	15	24	15	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	17	29	20	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	17	14	17	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31	10	39	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.00%	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 87%.</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain the same as the FFY 2006 reported data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that, for FFY 2007, no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain the same as the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, valid and reliable FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 data. The State provided the required recalculated data for FFYs 2005 and 2006.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 59%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 of 18 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining three findings subsequently were corrected within 14 months from identification.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 85%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY target of 85%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 75%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 37 of 40 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining three findings subsequently were corrected within 14 months from identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to report on the correction of the previously identified noncompliance regarding provision of services to preschool children with disabilities identified in CDS sites that it followed up</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the 13 remaining findings of noncompliance regarding provision of services to preschool children with disabilities identified in CDS sites that it followed up on in its September 2007 letters. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision systems. The State must take the steps necessary to</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>on in its September 2007 letters. The State reported that, of 14 total findings of noncompliance identified prior to September 2007, none were corrected within one year, one subsequently was verified as corrected, and 13 remained open. The State reported that the 13 CDS sites with uncorrected findings of noncompliance have corrective action plans in place and technical assistance has been provided. The State reported that correction of this noncompliance will be monitored in FFY 2008 and reported on in the FFY 2008 APR. OSEP further required the State to report on the correction of the previously identified noncompliance regarding the provision of services to preschool children identified in the monitoring reports MDOE issued to CDS sites on July 9, 2007, November 15, 2007 and December 7, 2007. The State reported that: (1) 14 of 21 findings of noncompliance with Part B identified in the July 9, 2007 monitoring report were corrected in a timely manner and that the seven remaining areas of noncompliance would be reviewed in the FFY 2008 year as part of their second year of monitoring; (2) nine of the 12 findings of noncompliance with Part B identified in the November 17, 2007 monitoring report were corrected in a timely manner and that the three remaining areas of noncompliance would be reviewed in the FFY 2008 year as part of the second year of monitoring; and (3) 15 of 18 findings of noncompliance with Part B identified in the December 4, 2007 monitoring report were corrected in a timely manner and that the three remaining areas of noncompliance would be reviewed in the FFY 2008 year as part of the second year of monitoring.</p> <p>Finally, OSEP required the State to report on the correction of the remaining four findings of noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005. The State reported that all four findings of noncompliance have been corrected and each of the four LEAs received a closeout letter confirming acceptance of their documentation of corrective actions.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported throughout the APR on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance and on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA or CDS site with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet. The State must confirm in the FFY 2008 APR that it has included in the Indicator 15 Worksheet all Part B findings of noncompliance from both CDS</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		sites and school districts.
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on seven due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 data for this indicator are 60%. The State reported that three of five resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 35%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 85%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 78%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 82.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 95.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.